



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/615,785

07/10/2003

Masafumi Igo

249-312

1498

23117

7590

04/13/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC  
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

DEGHAN, QUEENIE S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1731

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

CM

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/615,785	<b>Applicant(s)</b> IGO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Queenie Dehghan	<b>Art Unit</b> 1731	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - a. Item 210 noted on page 1 line 18 is not in Fig. 5. However, item 10 is in the figure and not mentioned in the specification.
  - b. The term "power falling" on page 3 line 55 is misspelled.
  - c. The brief description of the drawings lists Fig. 2 twice and does not list Figure 4.

Appropriate correction is required.

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. A covered roller was not disclosed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1731

4. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ostendarp et al. (6,502,423). Ostendarp et al. disclose an apparatus for manufacturing glass pane that is drawn vertically down from a hot forming tool (col. 1 lines 8-10) and subsequently cooled (col. 2 lines 25-26). Fig. 3 depicts the apparatus, which comprises rollers/pinching portions (11 in fig. 3) that is engaged on the respective edges of the glass band (col. 6 lines 60-61) and has a shaft that is longer than the width of the glass (12). Furthermore, the rollers/pinching portions are expected to be inherently heat resistant since it is handling molten glass from the hot forming tool (col. 6 lines 25-28, 57-64).

5. Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smids (4,612,030) or Uchida et al. (JP5124826). Smids disclose an apparatus for manufacturing sheet glass that has been softened in a furnace (col. 2 lines 16-17) and subsequently guided by a pair of pinch rollers each with a short shaft, each disposed on one end side of the short shaft, and pinches a respective side end portions of the glass (col. 2 lines 50-53, 24a & 24 b in figure 2). Furthermore, the rollers/pinching portions are expected to be inherently heat resistant since it is handling molten glass. Uchida et al. disclose an apparatus for forming sheet glass comprising of pinch rollers (items 5-7 in drawing 1) disposed on one end side of a short shaft and pinches the respective side end portions of the glass plate (item 8 in drawing 1). Furthermore, the rollers are constructed of heat resistant material ([0024]).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostendarp et al. (6,502,423), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Gorman (3,853,525). Ostendarp et al. disclose the use of rollers in a sheet glass manufacturing apparatus, but do not disclose the details of the rollers. Gorman teach the use of heat resistant rollers (col. 1 lines 17-20) made up of discs (col. 2 lines 45-51) that are laminated/coated together (col. 2 lines 15-22, col. 4 lines 18-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the laminated discs of Gorman in the rollers of Ostendarp et al., in order prolong the life of the rollers, as taught by Gorman.

Art Unit: 1731

9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smids (4,612,030) or Uchida et al. (JP5124826), as applied to claim 4 above, in view of Gorman (3,853,525). Smids and Uchida disclose the use of rollers in a sheet glass manufacturing apparatus, but do not disclose the details of the rollers. Gorman teaches the use of heat resistant rollers (col. 1 lines 17-20) made up of discs (col. 2 lines 45-51) that are laminated/coated together (col. 2 lines 15-22, col. 4 lines 18-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the laminated discs of Gorman in the rollers of Smids or Uchida, in order to prolong the life of the rollers, as taught by Gorman.

10. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostendarp et al. (6,502,423), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Lock (5,460,638). Ostendarp et al. disclose the use of rollers in a sheet glass manufacturing apparatus, but do not disclose the details of the rollers. Lock teaches the use of a molding body in the pinching portions of the rollers (col. 1 lines 65-67, col. 2 lines 1-5, figure 1), where inherently are made of heat resistant materials since they are molding molten glass (col. 3 lines 21-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the molding body of Lock in the rollers of Ostendarp et al., in order to allow for shaping of the sheet glass, as taught by Lock.

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smids (4,612,030) or Uchida et al. (JP5124826), as applied to claim 4 above, in view of Lock (5,460,638). Smids and Uchida disclose the use of rollers in a sheet glass manufacturing apparatus, but do not disclose the details of the rollers. Lock teaches the

Art Unit: 1731


use of a molding body in the pinching portions of the rollers (col.1 lines 65-67, col. 2 lines 1-5, figure 1), where inherently are made of heat resistant materials since they are molding molten glass (col. 3 lines 21-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the molding body of Lock in the rollers of Smids or Uchida, in order to allow for shaping of the sheet glass, as taught by Lock.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Queenie Dehghan whose telephone number is (571)272-8209. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
STEVEN P. GRIFFIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Application/Control Number: 10/615,785

Page 7

Art Unit: 1731

Q Dehghan